



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
2 NAVY ANNEX
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

CRS
Docket No: 75-01
25 January 2001

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 18 January 2001. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you enlisted in the Navy on 11 January 1999 at age 21. The record reflects that from 5 May 1999 until your apprehension on 21 May 2000, a period of 376 days, you were an unauthorized absentee. While the request is not in your record, it is presumed that you submitted a written request for an other than honorable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing offense. It is also presumed that prior to submitting this request, and in accordance with applicable directives, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. It also appears that your request was granted and, as a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor. The record clearly shows that you received an other than honorable discharge on 28 June 2000 for the good of the service in order to escape trial. At that time you were assigned a reenlistment code of RE-4.

The Board noted that applicable regulations require the assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code when an individual is discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial. Since you have been treated no differently than others in your situation, the Board could not find an error or injustice in the assignment of your reenlistment code. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

The Board did not consider whether your characterization of service should be changed, since you did not ask for such consideration and you have not exhausted your administrative remedy by applying to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB). You may apply to NDRB by submitting the attached DD Form 293.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director

Enclosure